

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, NH

Minutes of August 14, 2017

Members Present: Chair Ivy Vann, Ed Juengst, Alan Zeller, Jerry Galus, Rich Clark and Joe Hanlon

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development

Chair Vann called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and introduced the members and staff. “This is our regularly scheduled Monday night meeting” she said adding “we’ll start with the Minutes.”

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Galus/Zeller) to approve the Minutes of July 10, 2017 as written with all in favor.

Proposed South Peterborough Tax Increment Finance District (SP TIF):

Mr. Throop noted the Chairman of the SP TIF would be a member of the EDA and the Vice Chairman would be a member of the Planning Board. “We will need a member willing to serve and I am looking to see who might be interested.” Mr. Throop noted the final SP TIF plan and map would be presented at the next Select Board meeting (8/15/17) and that a special town meeting was scheduled for October 26th. “There will be plenty of opportunity for discussion and a public hearing will be held in September” he said. He told the members the advisory board meets at least once a year “but initially there may be additional meetings for input as we finalize the District.” Both Chair Vann and Mr. Galus indicated they were interested in serving. When Mr. Zeller asked about the time of the meetings Mr. Throop explained “usually in the morning as recommendations for the TIF are often done at a joint meeting with the EDA.”

Chair Vann concluded the discussion by explaining how a TIF District works. “It is put in place where significant development is anticipated” she said adding “any increase in evaluation for that area goes into a special fund for improvements to be made without impacting the tax payer.” Mr. Throop pointed out the proposed geographical area of the new TIF which included the area of Church Street and the Rivermead Campus to Morison’s gravel pit, backing up to the Village Commercial

District.

Mr. Clark noted his dismay with the changes recently made to the West Peterborough TIF that allowed using TIF monies for maintenance. Mr. Jeungst interjected that the law permits maintenance, the benefits of collecting revenue associated with new development were phenomenal, and that all TIFs have a set life span. "Improving the infrastructure in the normal way likely would have projects competing for money" he said. "I just really disagree, that is all" replied Mr. Clark.

Preliminary Consultation - Conceptual Review: Chair Vann read the application for a Conditional Use Permit under the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I for the construction of a single-family home with an accessory dwelling unit, to be located on land owned by 87 Grove LLC, located at 87 Grove Street, Parcel No. U018-082-000.

Before continuing Chair Vann explained how conceptual reviews work. "It is a chance to show the Planning Board what you are thinking of doing and what the Planning Board and abutters think of it. It is not binding in any way, it is a chance to have a conversation" she said adding "the best example would be Global Montello because what they *proposed* is definitely not what we have with many changes done before a lot of money and engineering went into the project."

Beth Alpaugh-Cote stood and introduced herself. She used the projector to indicate the location of the project on Grove Street with an elevation of the front (Grove Street view) of the building. "87 Grove Street LLC owns the property" she said adding "and we are using the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I ordinance (TND I) and will be seeking a Conditional Use Permit to build a single-family house with an attached garage and an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)."

Ms. Alpaugh-Cote proceeded to show the members an elevation of the proposed building from all sides as well as the off-street parking. She showed a historical aerial photograph of the lot that showed a building (since demolished) between numbers 85 and 89 Grove Street that Ms. Alpaugh-Cote referred to as "87 Grove Street" as that was its address before the demolition. Pointing to the parcel map, she told the members "as you can see it is fairly tight." She went on to say "it is in the General Residence Zoning District, has town water and sewer, and has 64 feet of road frontage with no building on it." She noted the setback would be similar to the houses to the left and right of it.

As a plot plan was projected Ms. Alpaugh-Cote told the members her plan included 48% lot coverage including the building, garage and shared driveway. Chair Vann interjected the impervious material lot coverage allowed using TND I was 35% lot coverage in the General Residence District and noted her concern. It was also noted by Mr. Throop that inadvertently it had been discovered that the TND I periphery was largely located within the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone “and that has a maximum of 20% of the land area” he said.

Projecting a map of Grove Street, Ms. Alpaugh-Cote told the members “of the 23 lots shown 15 are nonconforming with lot coverage greater than 20% and four of those are greater than the 48% we are asking for.” Ms. Alpaugh-Cote told the members the demolished house had previous house had a 46% lot coverage. She concluded that the style of the house would fit the neighborhood and that she hoped the Board would approve her conceptual proposal. Chair Vann thanked her and said replied “well we’re not going to approve anything tonight but you did a nice job!”

As Chair Vann asked for questions from the members Mr. Zeller asked about the location of the ADU with Ms. Alpaugh Cote replying the single family home would be in the front with the garage in the middle and the ADU in the back “all one building” she said. Mr. Clark asked about the shared driveway and Mr. Hanlon asked for clarification on how vehicles would “swing” into the garages. Several members were in agreement when Mr. Galus asked about the building being two feet from the property line to the north. Ms. Alpaugh-Cote noted that portion of the building was solid wall and would not be bothered by car headlights or noise. Mr. Galus suggested the Fire Chief be contacted and informed.

Chair Vann again noted her concern with the Groundwater Overlay Zone with Ms. Alpaugh-Cote noting “it may be helpful to know the previous coverage was 46%” adding “it is a baseline to think about.” She also offered the creation of rain gardens for storm water run-off. Chair Vann replied “I suspect you may need to do that anyway as you know no water can leave the property.” She concluded with “either way, let’s make it clear that you will need a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment” before she opened the hearing up to the public.

John Kaufhold introduced himself as an abutter in favor of the project. “You have developed a regulation to allow something like this infill, you should encourage it. If this allows for more density, you ought to allow it” he said

Bruce Webb introduced himself as an abutter and asked to see the front elevation of the home again. “That is what we will be looking at” he said. Ms. Alpaugh-Cote obliged and pointed out the structural likenesses to the neighborhood’s homes. Chair Vann interjected “big house, little house, back house, barn” adding “but will it fit?” Tyler Ward introduced himself and asked what Ms. Alpaugh-Cote’s intentions were for the home. “Do you want to sell it? Rent it? Ms. Alpaugh-Cote replied I want to move into it and spend the next thirty years there.”

Workshop Discussion: Zoning Subcommittee Update:

Chair Vann told the members this Subcommittee consisted of herself, Bob Holt, Kristin Bixby, Mr. Throop and Karen Fitzgerald. She noted they had been working on a proposal to combine and clarify TND I and TND II, add Form Based Code descriptions (using a beta Place Code book from CNU Seattle “so we are not reinventing the wheel” she said), and resolve discrepancies between TND I and TND II and other Overlay Districts. We will conduct public workshops tentatively scheduled for September 13th, October 16th and November 20th that will include tabletop exercises on what people want and what their hopes are. “This should not be any different from what we heard last year” interjected Chair Vann adding “we are making sure we are in synch with the public.”

Mr. Throop noted a major discrepancy was that almost all of TND I was located within the Groundwater Protection District and pointed out a recent Administrative Decision by the Code Enforcement Officer that stated the maximum 20% impervious surface allowed in the District trumped any underlying zoning. He also noted a portion of the Code Officer’s decision was being appealed to the ZBA in September. He noted that base mapping and illustrations would be prepared for the public hearings and that Chair Vann and Mr. Fitzgerald would be doing a walk around survey with the merchants on four items including *traffic, observed changes in demographics, how long they have been in business and seasonal changes*. From the audience Ray Cote asked “are the forms freely available?” Chair Vann briefly explained the Congress for New Urbanism (CNU)’s Project for Code Reform is looking at other ways to reform zoning and enable urbanism to occur in places where you might not be able to get a complete form-based code done. She then replied “yes, it is free and available to the people. They *want* us to use it and encourage towns like us to use it.”

Consider Changes to the Parking Ordinance (245-32):

“I have been thinking about this for a long time” said Chair Vann adding “and here is my proposal about parking requirements.” Chair Vann went on to suggest elimination of the minimum parking requirements telling the members “we are not so great at figuring out how much parking is needed.” Chair Vann went on to note

that proposing a zoning change making parking by right with the old minimum to become the maximum number of spaces allowed “and if people want more (parking) they can come to us and tell us why.” Mr. Zeller interjected “so the new maximum is the old minimum” with Chair Vann replying” yes and if you want to open a new restaurant we are not going to tell you how many parking spaces you need.”

The members reviewed a projected schedule of current requirements and a brief discussion (which included Mr. Cote’s required parking minimums 19 years ago and any ramifications that may be generated when he goes to sell his business) followed. Mr. Throop suggested taking a closer look at the maximums to make sure they will work. Chair Vann concluded the discussion by noting “thinking about it, I think it will work. As long as you can find an open spot (which we can) it is OK, we’ve got parking.”

From the audience Tyler Ward asked “so when do we install parking meters?” Chair Vann reiterated what she had said at the July 10th meeting about Don Shoup’s, (Research Professor and expert in the economics of parking) conclusion that there was no need for meters when there is an open space on every block (and even on the day of the Broke Art Festival there was hardly a time that there was not at least one empty spot in front of the Town House, down Grove Street and on Main Street. “I know because I was there watching. At free, our parking is appropriately priced” she said.

Clarifying meeting dates Mr. Throop noted the zoning subcommittee would meet August 30th and September 6th to prepare for a Public Hearing September 13th at the Peterborough Town Library with additional Public Hearings scheduled for normal Planning Board Workshop dates of October 16th and November 20th.

Other Business:

None

Next Meeting:

September 11, 2017

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant